

Mr. Speaker, human cloning, if it is not already here, it is certainly on the fast track. It is not a matter of if, it is a matter of when. It seems to me we have to make sure that just because science possesses the capability to create cloned human beings that it not be permitted to carry out such plans, especially when the newly created humans would be used for the purpose of exploitation, abuse, and destructive experimentation.

Once created human life, Mr. Speaker, can survive a few seconds, a few minutes, a few days, a few weeks, a few months, a few years, perhaps many years to old age. We need to understand the profound truth that life is a continuum.

Earlier in the debate, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) stated that research scientists would simply "stop the process," so the newly created human life couldn't mature. Think about those words—stop the process. What does that mean, stop the process? It's a euphemistic way of saying stop the life process—kill it.

Mr. Speaker, finally I remember the debate we had in 1996 when some of our colleagues who routinely vote against the wellbeing of unborn children assured us that they would never support creating human embryos for experimentation. One colleague, the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), said "We should not be involved in the creation of embryos for research. I completely agree with my colleagues on that score."

Well, not anymore. Now the ever expendable human embryo is to be cloned and abused for the benefit of mankind. And that vigorous opposition to embryo research by colleagues like Mrs. PELOSI exists no more, Such a pity.

In like manner, members who say they oppose human cloning and then vote for Greenwood are either kidding themselves—or us—or both.

Reject Greenwood.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The Chair would inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) that he has 4 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds just to respond, both bills absolutely, positively stop human cloning, period.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL). Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I agonized over this, researched it, and know the heartfelt feelings on both sides of the issue. I am unequivocally against human cloning, but I am for a continuation of the research. And I rise in support of the Greenwood-Deutsch amendment because I am convinced that that is the only way that research can continue.

We are on the verge of lifesaving treatments and cures that affect our children and our parents, and to stifle this research now would be an injustice

to so many suffering with juvenile and adult diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and other debilitating diseases that claim our loved ones every day.

Some people will say this is not about research; that there is a moral and ethical obligation to protect the sanctity of life, and I respect that. But the sanctity of life is helped, I think, by allowing cutting edge research to move forward that will free diabetic children of their hourly ritual of finger pricks, glucose testing, and insulin shots; that will allow those paralyzed or suffering from spinal cord injuries to walk and resume their normal lives; and that will allow our seniors to fulfill their golden years without suffering the effects of Alzheimer's.

So I will cast my vote for Greenwood-Deutsch, which does ban cloning, and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I rise in opposition to the Greenwood substitute and for the base bill introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

The Committee on Commerce held several hearings on cloning, including one in the Subcommittee on Health, which I chair. There is no doubt, as has already been stated so many times, that this is a difficult issue, and it involves many new and complex concepts. However, we should all be clear about the controversies related to human cloning. While this debate claims to be about therapeutic cloning, which is used to refer to cloned human cells not intended to result in a pregnancy, there is a fine line between creation and implantation.

The Committee on Commerce heard testimony from the Geron Corporation. They claim to be interested in therapeutic cloning and not implementing implanting those embryos into a surrogate mother. I think we all agree it would be a disaster to allow the implantation of cloned human embryos. Yet, if we allow therapeutic cloning, how can we truly prevent illegal implantation? We cannot.

Several years ago, the world marveled at the creation of Dolly, the cloned sheep. What most people did not realize was that it took some 270 cloning attempts before there was a successful live birth. Many of the other attempts resulted in early and grotesque deaths. Imagine repeating that scenario with human life. I am confident that none of us want that. Human cloning rises to the most essential question of who we are and what we might become if we open this Pandora's box.

Finally, I would like to applaud President Bush more for his strong

support of this important base legislation. The administration strongly supports a ban on human cloning. The statement of the administration position reads, and I quote, "The administration unequivocally is opposed to the cloning of human beings either for reproduction or for research. The moral and ethical issues posed by human cloning are profound and cannot be ignored in the quest for scientific discovery."

I commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Michigan; and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 250 and opposing the substitute.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on this measure. In fact, I thank all four primary sponsors of the measures that are before us today for their concern and for the effective ban on cloning of human beings.

The central issue, it seems to me, that is before us this afternoon was brought home to me by a prayer for healing that I heard in a service a couple of weeks ago. It goes like this. "May the source of strength who blessed the ones before us help us find the courage to make our lives a blessing, and let us say amen."

It struck me that giving human beings the potential of using one's own DNA, one's own life itself to derive the cure for one's own malady, without fear of rejection, without risk of a fruitless national search for a match, is the deepest benefit and most profound blessing conceivable. We should not waste this deepest of gifts.

Help us find the courage to make our lives, our life itself, a blessing.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, during the Nuremberg war crime trials, the Nuremberg Code was drafted as a set of standards for judging physicians and scientists who had conducted biomedical experiments on concentration camp prisoners. I bring this to my colleagues' attention because part of the code, I think, is applicable to our debate today.

The code states that any experiment should yield results that are "unprocurable by other methods or means of study." Because stem cells can be obtained from other tissues and fluids of adult subjects without harm, perhaps it is unnecessary to perform cell extraction from embryos that would result in their death. This would be an argument, I think, that would support the Weldon bill; and so I reluctantly, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is making a very good and strong case, I oppose his amendment.